



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,634	11/28/2001	Daryl Dean Schroeder	10015860-1	7723

7590 12/18/2009  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

PHAM, TUAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2618

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/18/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/994,634  
Filing Date: November 28, 2001  
Appellant(s): SCHROEDER, DARYL DEAN

---

Dan C. Hu  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 10/02/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 05/07/2009.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

U.S. Patent Number: 6,748,005	Riazi et al.	June 8, 2004
U.S. Patent Number: 5,877,745	Beeteson et al.	March 2, 1999
U.S. Patent Number: 7,200,649	Batke et al.	April 3, 2007

U.S. Patent Number: 5,905,719	Arnold et al.	May 18, 1999
U.S. Pub. Number: 2002/0165007	Gawne	November 7, 2002

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

- A. Claims 1, 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- B. Claims 1-2, 5-8, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005).
- C. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005) in view of Beetesson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,877,745).
- D. Claims 9-10, 12-13, 22-23 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005) in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649) and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719).
- E. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005) in view of Gawne (US Pub. No.: 2002/0165007).
- F. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005) in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649) and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Beetesson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,877,745).

Art Unit: 2618

- G. Claims 21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazzi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005) in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649) and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Gawne (US Pub. No.: 2002/0165007).

These rejections are set forth in a prior Final Office Action, mailed on 05/07/2009 as followed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 25, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added subject matter of “the monitor wireless transceiver is to extract the video data from the wireless signal” to dependent claims 1, 25, and 31 is considered new matter because the specification as original filed does not provide support for such limitation.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-2, 5-8, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi").**

**Regarding claim 1**, Riazi teaches a display monitor (see figure 1, display 14), comprising:

a monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 1, figure 8, wireless monitor 14, data radio modem 112) configured to receive from a computer wireless transceiver of a computer main unit wireless signal containing video data, wherein the monitor wireless transceiver is to extract the video data from the wireless signal (see figure 1, figures 8-9, data radio modem 112 is received the video data from the computer 30 via the data radio modem 128 of the base station 20, demodulation part of Riazi extract the video and audio data from the carrier signal that modulated when transmit, in this case, the demodulator can be integrated with the modem 112, or it is inherent that the modem is included demodulator, and the term of modem defined as modulation-demodulation);

a computer display device (see monitor 14), and

a display driver (read on a video-audio receiver)(see figure 8, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110) coupled between the computer display device and the monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 8, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110, display 14, data radio modem 112) wherein the display driver is configured to receive from the monitor wireless transceiver the extracted video data (see figure 1, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110 receives the RF signal receive from the transceiver of the base station 20, in this case, the demodulator can be integrated with the modem 112), translate the extracted video data to produce translated video data, and provide the translated video data to the computer display device (the video-audio receiver block 110 receives the RF signal from the base station 20, the RF signal includes a video and audio data. It is clearly seen that the video-audio receiver 110 **converts the video data** receive from the base station 20 for displaying the video data to the monitor display 14, see figure 8, video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110, monitor display 14, col.5, ln. 64-65, col.6, ln.1-15, col.10, ln.60-61).

**Regarding claim 2**, Riazi further teaches the monitor wireless transceiver are configured to employ radio frequency (RF) communications (see figure 1, col.3, ln.61).

**Regarding claim 5**, Riazi further teaches an audio port configured to connect one or more audio devices to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, audio port 24, col.4, ln.12-15); and an audio driver (see figure 8, video-audio receiver 110 should includes a driver); wherein said audio port and said audio driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are configured to relay data between said computer

Art Unit: 2618

main unit and said one or more audio devices (see figures 1, 8, data radio modem block 112 includes a driver, audio port 24, computer 30).

**Regarding claim 6**, Riazi further teaches the audio port and the audio driver relay data to and from the one or more audio devices (see figure 1, figure 8, audio port 24, data radio modem block 112, speaker 52, MIC 54, col.4, ln.25-40).

**Regarding claim 7**, Riazi further teaches keyboard port configured to connect a keyboard to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, keyboard port 32, display 14); and a keyboard driver (data radio modem block 112 includes a driver); wherein said keyboard port and said keyboard driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are configured to relay data from said keyboard to said computer main unit in a wireless manner (see figure 1, figure 8, keyboard port 32, data radio modem block 112, computer 30, col.4, ln.12-15).

**Regarding claim 8**, Riazi further teaches a pointing device port configured to connect one or more pointing devices to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 8, it is clearly seen that the block 112 should includes a connector for connect the mouse 16); and a pointing device driver (see block 112 should include driver); wherein said pointing device port and said pointing device driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are configured to relay data from said one or more pointing devices to said computer main unit in a wireless manner (see figure 8, pointing device 16 connect to block 112, col.4, ln.10-15).

**Regarding claim 25**, Riazi teaches a computer system comprising (see figure 1):



Art Unit: 2618

a computer main unit (see figure 1, computer 30);

a computer wireless transceiver connected to said computer main unit (see figures 1&9, modem 128 is inside the base station 20, computer 30), and

a first wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, wireless monitor 10), including:

a monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 1, figure 8, wireless monitor 14, data radio modem 112) configured to receive from the computer main unit via the computer wireless transceiver wireless signal containing video data wherein the monitor wireless transceiver is to extract the video data from the wireless signal (see figure 1, figures 8-9, data radio modem 112 is received the video data from the computer 30 via the data radio modem 128 of the base station 20, demodulation part of Riazi extract the video and audio data from the carrier signal that modulated when transmit, in this case, the demodulator can be integrated with the modem 112, or it is inherent that the modem is included demodulator, and the term of modem defined as modulation-demodulation);

a computer display device (see figure 8, display 14), and

a data translator (see figure 8, read on a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110), coupled between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 8, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110, display 14, data radio modem 112), for receiving from the monitor wireless transceiver the extracted video data (see figure 8, col.6, ln.1-15, a video- audio receiver and demodulator 110 receives the RF signal from the base station 20), translating the extracted video data to produce translated video data, and providing the translated video data to the computer display device (the video-audio receiver block 110 receives the RF signal from the base

Art Unit: 2618

station 20, the RF signal includes a video and audio data. It is clearly seen that the video-audio receiver 110 **converts the video data** receive from the base station 20 for displaying the video data to the monitor display 14, see figure 8, video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110, monitor display 14, col.5, ln.64-65, col.6, ln.1-15, col.10, ln.60-61).

**Regarding claim 26**, Riazi further teaches display driver (read on the video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110)(the video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110 receives the RF signal from the base station 20, the RF signal includes a video and audio data. It is clearly seen that the video-audio receiver and demodulator 110 **converts the video data** receive from the base station 20 for displaying the video data to the monitor display 14, see figure 8, video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110, monitor display 14, col.5, ln. 64-65, col.6, ln.1-15, col.10, ln.60-61).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Beetesson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,877,745, hereinafter, "Beetesson").**

**Regarding claim 3**, Riazi disclosed invention, but fails to disclose infrared communication. However, Beetesson teaches infrared communication (see figure 3, IR transceiver 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Beetesson into view of Riazi in order to communicate in short range.

**6. Claims 9-10, 12-13, 22-23 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649, hereinafter, "Batke") and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719, hereinafter, "Arnold").**

**Regarding claim 9**, Riazi teaches a computer system, comprising (see figure 1):  
a computer wireless transceiver (see figure 1, figure 9, modem 128), coupled to said computer main unit (see figure 1, computer 30, base station 20 which include modem 128), for relaying wireless communications to and from said computer main unit (see figure 1, computer 30, base station 20 which include modem 128); and

a first wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, wireless monitor 10), said first wireless computer monitor comprising; a monitor wireless transceiver performing wireless communications (see figure 8, modem 112); and a computer display device (see figure 8, display 14), said monitor wireless transceiver is configured to wirelessly communicate with computer wireless transceiver (see figures 1, 8-9, monitor 10 is wirelessly communicate with base station 20 via wireless link 12),

a display driver (read on video-audio receiver block 110) connected between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver (see figure 8, video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110, modem 112, monitor display 14),

the monitor wireless transceiver to receive wireless signals containing video data from the computer wireless transceiver (see figure 1, a video-audio receiver and demodulator 110 receives the RF signal receive from the transceiver of the base station 20), and the display driver to translate video data contained in the received wireless signals to translated video data provided to the computer display device (the video-audio receiver block 110 receives the RF signal from the base station 20, the RF signal includes a video and audio data. It is clearly seen that the video-audio receiver and demodulator 110 **converts the video data** receive from the base station 20 for displaying the video data to the monitor display 14, see figure 8, video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110, monitor display 14, col.5, ln. 64-65, col.6, ln.1-15, col.10, ln.60-61).

It should be noticed that Riazi fails to teach a computer main unit having a unique address associated therewith, However, Batke teaches a computer main unit having a unique address associated therewith (see col.13, ln.8-45, each computer assign its own unique address).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Batke into view of Riazi in order to support multiple computers over network.

Riazi and Batke, in combination, fails to teach said wireless communication includes data and said unique address. However, Arnold teaches said wireless communication includes data and said unique address (see col.6, ln.13-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Arnold into view of Riazi and Batke in order to support multiple computers over network.

**Regarding claim 10**, Riazi further teaches a computer system wherein the computer wireless transceiver and the monitor wireless transceiver are configured to employ radio frequency (RF) communications (see figure 1, col.3, ln.61).

**Regarding claim 12**, Riazi further teaches said first wireless computer-monitor further comprises: an audio port capable of connecting one or more audio devices to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, audio port 24, col.4, ln.12-15); and an audio driver (see figure 8, video and audio 110); wherein said audio port and said audio driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are capable of relaying data between said computer main unit and said one or more audio devices in a wireless manner (see figures 1, 8, video and audio 110, audio port 24, computer 30).

**Regarding claim 13**, Riazi further teaches the audio port and the audio driver relay data to and from the one or more audio devices (see figure 1, figure 8, audio port 24, audio demodulator 110, speaker 52, MIC 54, col.4, ln.25-40).

**Regarding claim 22**, Riazi further teaches keyboard port configured to connect a keyboard to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 1, keyboard port 32, display 14); and a keyboard driver (data radio modem block 112 includes a driver); wherein said

Art Unit: 2618

keyboard port and said keyboard driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are configured to relay data from said keyboard to said computer main unit in a wireless manner (see figure 1, figure 8, keyboard port 32, data radio modem block 112, computer 30, col.4, ln.12-15).

**Regarding claim 23**, Riazi further teaches a pointing device port configured to connect one or more pointing devices to said wireless computer monitor (see figure 8, it is clearly seen that the block 112 should includes a connector for connect the mouse 16); and a pointing device driver (see block 112 should include driver); wherein said pointing device port and said pointing device driver are connected to said monitor wireless transceiver and are configured to relay data from said one or more pointing devices to said computer main unit in a wireless manner (see figure 8, pointing device 16 connect to block 112, col.4, ln.10-15).

**Regarding claim 31**, Riazi further teaches the monitor wireless transceiver is to extract the video data from the received wireless signals, and the device driver is to translate the extracted video data to the translated video data (see figure 1, figures 8-9, data radio modem 112 is received the video data from the computer 30 via the data radio modem 128 of the base station 20, demodulation part of Riazi extract the video and audio data from the carrier signal that modulated when transmit, in this case, the demodulator can be integrated with the modem 112, or it is inherent that the modem is included demodulator, and the term of modem defined as modulation-demodulation).

**7. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Gawne (US Pub. No.: 2002/0165007).**

**Regarding claim 27**, Riazi disclosed invention, but fails to teach a second wireless monitor, and wherein each of said first and second wireless monitors has a unique address for wireless communication, such that each of said first and second wireless monitors is capable configured to receive unique data from said computer concurrently with the other of said first and second wireless monitors. However, Gawne teaches a second wireless monitor, and wherein each of said first and second wireless monitors has a unique address for wireless communication, such that each of said first and second wireless monitors is capable configured to receive unique data from said computer concurrently with the other of said first and second wireless monitors (see figure 3, display 312A-312C, [0004-006]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gawne into view of Riazi in order to provide a low cost system as suggested by Gawne at [0004].

**Regarding claim 28**, Riazi teaches all the limitation of claim 28, except a second display monitor. However, Gawne teaches a second display monitor (see figure 3, display 312A-312C, [0004-006], it is clearly seen that the second display monitor of Gawne can be modify that includes all the components of the Riazi's display).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gawne into view of Riazzi in order to provide a low cost system as suggested by Gawne at [0004].

**Regarding claim 29**, Gawne teaches wireless computer monitors have unique addresses that are communicated in wireless communications between the computer main unit and the wireless computer monitors (see figure 3, display 312A-312C, [0004-006, 0024]).

8. **Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazzi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazzi") in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649, hereinafter, "Batke") and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719, hereinafter, "Arnold") as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Beetesson et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,877,745, hereinafter, "Beetesson").**

**Regarding claim 11**, Riazzi, Batke, and Arnold, in combination, fails to teach infrared communication. However, Beetesson teaches infrared communication (see figure 3, IR transceiver 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Beetesson into view of Riazzi, Batke, and Arnold in order to communicate in short range.



**9. Claims 21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,748,005, hereinafter, "Riazi") in view of Batke et al. (US Patent No.: 7,200,649, hereinafter, "Batke") and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent No.: 5,905,719, hereinafter, "Arnold") as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Gawne (US Pub. No.: 2002/0165007).**

**Regarding claim 21,** Riazi teaches a wireless computer system that included wireless monitor and wireless PC. Riazi, Batke, and Arnold, in combination, fails to teach a second wireless monitor, said second wireless computer monitor having a unique address for wireless communication, and including a monitor wireless transceiver performing wireless communications, and a computer display device connected to said monitor wireless transceiver of the second wireless computer monitor, wherein said second wireless monitor is configured to receive unique data from and transmit unique data to said computer main unit in a wireless manner through said monitor wireless transceiver and said computer wireless transceiver, concurrently with said first wireless computer monitor. However, Gawne teaches a second wireless monitor, said second wireless computer monitor having a unique address for wireless communication, and including a monitor wireless transceiver performing wireless communications, and a computer display device connected to said monitor wireless transceiver of the second wireless computer monitor, wherein said second wireless monitor is configured to receive unique data from and transmit unique data to said computer main unit in a wireless manner through said monitor wireless transceiver and said computer wireless transceiver, concurrently with said first wireless computer

Art Unit: 2618

monitor (see figures 3, 5, [0006, 0024], the wireless transceiver 504, display 312A-312C).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gawne into view of Riazi, Batke, and Arnold in order to provide a low cost system as suggested by Gawne at [0004].

**Regarding claim 30**, Gawne further teaches the first wireless computer monitor also has a unique address (see [0006, 0024]).

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

##### **(I) Appellant's first argument:**

In pages 5-6 of the Appeal Brief, the Appellant argues that the specification as original filed on 11/28/2001 inherently support for the newly added limitations "the monitor wireless transceiver is to extract the video data from the wireless signal" as recited in claims 1, 25 and 31 that was submitted on 02/05/2008.

In response to appellant's argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument. Examiner has carefully reviewed the paragraphs [0014, 0018] as point out by the Appellant that fails to disclose a single mention of the words "the monitor wireless transceiver is to extract the video data from the wireless signal". As such, it is Examiner's position that the original specification does not support "the monitor wireless transceiver is to extract the video data from the wireless signal" limitations. In addition, the Appellant further stated in page 6 of the Appeal Brief that "A

Art Unit: 2618

person of ordinary skill in the art would also clearly understand that the receiving wireless transceiver would receive the wireless signals carrying the data and would extract the data from the wireless signals". Examiner agrees with the appellant's argument that there is a means can receive the wireless signal and a means can extract the data from the wireless signal. However, the means to extract the data from the wireless signal does not have to be **located within the transceiver**. It can be located outside the transceiver. This is the scope of the claims that is not disclosed explicitly or inherently in the specification. Furthermore, the original specification totally silent to mention the means to extract the video data from the wireless signal that is **located in the transceiver**. Therefore, the monitor wireless transceiver is included the means to extract the video data from the wireless signal is **not inherent limitation** that was arguing by the Appellant.

**(II) Appellant's second arguments:**

In response to appellant's appeal brief on pages 8-10, the Appellant argues that Riazi fails to teach "translation the video data" as recited in claims 1, 9, and 25.

In response to appellant's arguments, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument. In this case, Riazi teaches a wireless monitor is included a video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110 that operate to extract the RF signals from the carrier wave signal and convert the extracted RF signals received from base station 20 into red, blue and green video signals transmitted to the wireless display 14. It is clearly seen that the video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110 is supported multi function such as extract the receive RF signals from the carrier wave signal and convert

Art Unit: 2618

the extracted RF signals into video signal. The video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110 comprises two parts. The video-audio receiver part and demodulator part. The demodulator part extract the RF signal from the carrier wave signal received from the base station and the video-audio receiver part convert the extracted RF signals into red, blue and green video signals transmitted to the wireless display 14 (see figure 8, video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110, monitor display 14, col.5, ln. 64-65, col.6, ln.1-15). Furthermore, the Appellant provide a definition in page 8 of Appeal Brief that defined "**translate**" as "**Convert**". Therefore, the video-audio receiver part of Riazi clearly show that it is translated the extracted RF signals into red, blue and green video signals transmitted to the wireless display 14 as recited in claims 1, 9, and 25.

Examiner further provide more evidence to support for the word "convert" in Riazi as equal to "translate" that disclosed by Beeteson et al. (US Patent No.: 5,877,745) reference in col.3, ln.1-15 as stated below:

"adaptor 15 **translates** output data from system unit 10 into R, G and B video signals, and H and V sync signals for configuring display device 20 to generate a visual data output"

As evidenced in Beeteson at column 3, lines 1-5, the term "**convert**" as equal to "**translate**". Therefore, Riazi teaches the translating the extracted RF signals to the video data for displaying on the screen.

**(III) Appellant's third arguments:**

In response to appellant's appeal brief on page 9, the Appellant argues that Riazzi fails to teach "translation the video data because the video displayed on the display 14 replicates the video display by the local PC monitor 46" as recited in claims 1, 9, and 25.

In response to appellant's arguments as stated above, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument. In col.6, ln.1-15 of Riazzi disclosed the video displayed on the display 14 replicates the video which would be displayed by the local PC monitor 46 if the terminal were not in use and the user was utilizing the PC 30. The system of Riazzi supports dual monitor function. Both of the display 14 and monitor 46 can display the same data or the same image on the screen at the same time. The term "**replicates**" means that both of the display 14 and monitor 46 can display the same data or the same image on the screen at the same time if both displays are in used. In this case, the local PC monitor 46 is not in used. So that, it is clearly seen that the wireless monitor 10 is receiving the RF signal **directly** from the base station 20 via RF link 12, NOT from the local PC monitor 46. In order to display the video on the screen of display 14, the video-audio receiver and demodulator block 110 have to extract the RF signal from the carrier signal and convert the extracted RF signals into red, blue and green video signals transmitted to the wireless display 14. Therefore, Riazzi teaches the translating the video data for displaying to the display 14. The act of taking the RF signals and changing them into red/green/blue digital signals that become the visual output on the monitor is what the Examiner interprets as "translation."

Additionally, the claimed translation means is simply the display driver 207 shown in Applicants' figure 2. Much like the Appellant arguments in response to the 112 rejection, a person of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand that a monitor device as shown in Riazzi, would some sort of driver or adapter to take a received signal and convert or translate it into compatible signals to be displayed on the monitor.

**(IV) Appellant's four arguments:**

In response to appellant's appeal brief on pages 11-12, the Appellant argues that Examiner has fails to combine Riazzi, Batke and Arnold as recited in independent claim 9.

In response to appellant's arguments, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument. It appears that the Appellant is attacking individual merits of Riazzi, Batke and Arnold and concludes that there is no impetus to combine them. However, one must consider **the combination of references as a whole** under a 103 rejection. One cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually. In re Keller, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). The test for obviousness is not whether features of one reference may be bodily incorporated into the other to produce claimed subject matter but simply what the combination of references makes obvious to one of ordinary skill in pertinent art. In re Bozek, (CCPA) 163 USPQ 545. The question in a rejection for obviousness on a combination of references is what secondary reference would teach one skilled in the art and not whether its structure could be bodily substituted in

basic reference structure. In re Richman, 165 USPQ 509 (CCPA 1970). In this regard, the intent of Batke and Arnold as a secondary teaching is not to combine its structural features into Riazzi, but rather to combine the known features of Batke and Arnold with the known features of Riazzi to achieve the claimed invention. KSR Int'l v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007), obviousness of claimed subject matter involving a combination of known features. Riazzi teaches a computer system support dual monitors. Both monitors can communicate with the main computer by wire and wireless. Batke teaches a plurality of computers and plurality of monitor that connect to the network by wire. Arnold teaches a wireless computer system to communicate wirelessly with base station. Since Riazzi, Batke and Arnold teach the personal computer system to communicate by wire or wireless which is the same environment. Examiner sees no reason why ordinary skilled artisans could not include the feature of Riazzi to combine with the feature of Batke and Arnold that would inherently provide the same function as appellant's invention. Furthermore, Batke and Arnold did not rely on a display driver to translate video data contained in received wireless signals to translated video data that was arguing by the Appellant.

Therefore, there is an existing a strong prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C 103, and proper to combine Riazzi, Batke, and Arnold.

**(V) Appellant's fifth arguments:**

In response to appellant's appeal brief on page 7, the Appellant argues that Examiner has conceded that Riazzi fails to teach "data translation means, couple between said computer display device and said monitor wireless transceiver" in the

Office Action dated 01/29/2007. Later, Examiner has used Riazzi to reject the data translation means as recited in claim 25 in the Office Action dated 05/07/2009.

In response to appellant's arguments, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument that Riazzi cannot be use later when it is not used for the first time to reject the claim. Examiner has overlooked Riazzi reference to reject the claim 25 in the Office Action dated 01/29/2007. However, after carefully reviewed the remark submitted on 08/30/2007, Examiner has determine that Riazzi reference qualify for claims 1, 9 and 25. Therefore, the appellant's argument is not persuasive.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/TUAN A PHAM/

Tuan Pham

December 08, 2009

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

Conferees:

Matthew Anderson

Supervisory Patent Examiner



Art Unit: 2618

/Matthew D. Anderson/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Edward Urban/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618